

REMARKS

Claims 90 and 93-141 are pending in this application. Claims 122 and 137 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication in the October 24, 2006 Office Action that claims 90, 93-121 and 130-136 are allowable.

Claims 122-129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rhodes (U.S. Patent No. 6,204,524) ("Rhodes"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a method of forming a CMOS imager with improved charge storage. As such, amended independent claim 122 recites a "method of forming an imager" by *inter alia* "forming a photosensor including a charge collection region . . . adjacent one side of a gate of a pixel transistor" and "forming a floating diffusion region for receiving charge from said charge collection region, said floating diffusion region being connected to said gate of said pixel transistor and being adjacent another side of said gate opposite said charge collection region." Amended independent claim 122 also recites "forming a charge storage capacitor . . . so that one electrode of said storage capacitor is connected directly to said floating diffusion region by an electrical contact."

Rhodes relates to a CMOS imager that "provides improved charge storage by fabricating a storage capacitor in parallel with the photocollection area of the imager." (Abstract). According to Rhodes, "[t]he storage capacitor may be a flat plate capacitor formed over the pixel, a stacked capacitor or a trench imager formed in the photosensor." (Abstract).

Rhodes fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 122-129. Rhodes does not disclose all limitations of amended independent claim 122. Rhodes does not disclose, teach or suggest "forming a photosensor including a charge collection region . . . adjacent one side of a gate of a pixel transistor" and "forming a floating diffusion region for receiving charge from said charge collection region, said floating diffusion region being connected to said gate of said pixel transistor and being adjacent another side of said gate opposite said charge collection region," much less "forming a charge storage capacitor . . . so that one electrode of said storage capacitor is connected directly to said floating diffusion region by an electrical contact," as claim 122 recites.

In Rhodes, storage capacitor 162, which would arguably correspond to the "charge storage capacitor" of the claimed invention, is connected to a fifth doped region 155 ("which is formed adjacent to the photogate 102") and not to the floating diffusion region 130. In addition, region 155 of Rhodes is not a "floating diffusion region . . . connected to a gate of a pixel transistor," as in the claimed invention. Further, no electrode of the storage capacitor 162 of Rhodes is connected directly to a floating diffusion region "by an electrical contact," as in the claimed invention. For at least the reasons above, Rhodes fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 122-129, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is solicited.

Claims 137-141 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Rhodes in view of Lauxtermann et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0015831) ("Lauxtermann"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 137 recites a "method of forming an imager" by *inter alia* "forming a photosensor including a charge collection region . . . adjacent one side of a gate of a pixel transistor," "forming a floating diffusion region . . . connected to said gate of said pixel transistor and being adjacent another side of said gate opposite

said charge collection region” and “connecting an electrode of a first charge storage capacitor to said floating diffusion region by a first electrical contact.” Amended independent claim 137 further recites “connecting an electrode of a second charge storage capacitor to said charge collection region by a second electrical contact.”

Lauxtermann relates to “a method for operating a CMOS image sensor including a matrix of pixels (50) arranged in a plurality of lines and columns, each of said pixels including a photosensor element (PD) accumulating charge carriers in proportion to the illumination thereof and storage means (C1,55) able to be coupled to said photosensor element (PD) at a determined instant in order to generate a sampled signal representative of said charge carriers accumulated by the photosensor, the storage means (C1, 55) being intended to assure storage for the purpose of reading said sampling signal.” (Abstract). According to Lauxtermann, “when said sampled signal, stored across said storage means is read, the photosensor element is held at a voltage such that any charge carrier generated by the latter is drained and thus does not disturb the sampled signal stored on the storage means.” (Abstract).

The subject matter of claims 137-141 would not have been obvious over Rhodes in view of Lauxtermann. Specifically, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Courts have generally recognized that a showing of a *prima facie* case of obviousness necessitates three requirements: (i) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings; (ii) a reasonable expectation of success; and (iii) the prior art references must teach or suggest all claim limitations. See e.g., In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 50 (Fed. Cir. 1999); In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 1998); Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568, 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

In the present case, neither Rhodes nor Lauxtermann discloses, teaches or suggests the subject matter of claims 137-141. Rhodes is silent about a "first charge storage capacitor" and a "second charge storage capacitor," much less about "connecting an electrode of a second charge storage capacitor to [a] charge collection region by a second electrical contact," as claim 137 recites. Rhodes teaches only one capacitor structure (i.e., capacitor 162) formed overlying an active area of the pixel sensor cell, and not a first and a second charge storage capacitors, as in the claimed invention.

Lauxtermann fails to supplement the deficiencies of Rhodes. Lauxtermann relates to a method of maintaining constant the sampled charge stored in memory node 55 during the read process (§[0010]), and not to methods of forming CMOS imagers, much less to methods of forming CMOS imagers by the specific steps of the claimed invention. Accordingly, and for at least these reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 137-141 is also respectfully requested.

Allowance of claims 90 and 93-141 is solicited.

Dated: December 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Gabriela I. Coman

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Gabriela I. Coman

Registration No.: 50,515

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants